



United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
08/579,395	12/27/1995	WILLIAM H. SWAIN		4200	
7	590 09/25/2002				
WILLIAM H SWAIN			EXAMINER		
4662 GLEASO SARASOTA, I			KARLSEN,	KARLSEN, ERNEST F	
	-	•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2829	29	
			DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		
	Application N .	Applicant(s)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	08/579,395	SWAIN, WILLIAM H.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Ernest F. Karlsen	2829
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period f r Reply	o ars on the cov r sheet with th	e correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS to cause the application to become ABANDX	e timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>18 i</u>	December 2001 .	
,_ .	nis action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allows		, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under Disp sition of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.
4) Claim(s) 32-66 is/are pending in the application	on.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>32-66</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		
Applicant may not request that any objection to th		
If approved, corrected drawings are required in re		proved by the Examiner.
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	carrintor.	
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. & 11	9(a)-(d) or (f)
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	in priority under 55 C.C.C. § 11	3(a)-(a) 51 (i).
,_ ,_ ,_	ts have been received	
 Certified copies of the priority document Certified copies of the priority document 		cation No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		
application from the International Bu * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ıreau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language pro 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest 		
Attachment(s)		
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	5) Notice of Inform	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) nal Patent Application (PTO-152)
C Data data da Collega		

Application/Control Number: 09/579,395

Art Unit: 2829

- 1. In response to requirements to elect applicant has argued that there are no patentably distinct inventions or species. Therefore, the Restriction Requirement of October 31, 2001 is withdrawn. Applicant states "my traverse relies on the fact that the basic concept (claim 14) is in every claim so no claim would be patentable over another because it would lack novelty outside of this application". This argument was made most recently in Paper No. 28 filed December 18, 2001. Current claim 45 is essentially the same as claim 14.
- 2. By Applicant's admission if claim 45 is not patentable no claim of the present application is patentable.
- 3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- 4. (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 5. Claims 32-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being fully anticipated by any one or Lee, Moser et al, Hubbard, Sweeny or Swain.

By Applicant's admission in Paper No. 28 the fate of claim 45 determines the fate of all claims so only claim 45 is discussed. Looking at Figure 4 of Sweeny, as an example, winding 45 senses a current applied by the source connected to winding 45. Winding 46 responds to the flux in the core 44 and produces a voltage that is applied to resistance 20. If a magnet were placed adjacent the core 44 it would cause undesired interference or "noise". Lines 4-13 of claim 45 deal with definition of signal-to-noise ratio and are not considered to add substance to claim 45. Lines

Page 3

Application/Control Number: 09/579,395

Art Unit: 2829

14 to 18 of claim 45 require that the signal-to-noise ratio of the sensor be substantially altered by

changing an operating parameter and also require a means enabling the sensor to substantially

increase its signal-to-noise ratio. In Figure 4 of Sweeny winding 47 applies a direct current bias

to the core 44 which will change the signal-to-noise ratio. Moving the tap of variable resistor 24

in a first direction will increase the signal to noise ratio and moving the tap in the opposite

direction will decrease the signal-to-noise ratio. Applicant has stated in his specification that

changing the bias on a saturable core device will change the signal-to-noise ratio.

Swain uses the same kind of core material as used in the present application and will thus

inherently have the "essential characteristic".

Karlson/ds

09/13/02

ERNEST KARLSEN